



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_26261
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES SELECTIONS AND ADOPTIONS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN THE COTTON BASIN OF BENIN
Type of Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The paper still shows the flaws that I outlined in my previous review. The author has done some minor corrections, but he has either misunderstood or chosen not to act on my remarks. First, his analysis is not supported by an economic model or even by a careful specification of the expected pattern of signs from the econometric analysis, on the basis of prior and plausible considerations. As a consequence, the discussion of the results is entirely ad hoc, in the sense that the author commentary to his results is no more than an ex post rationalization, and often trivial explanation, for the signs, the significances and the sizes of the coefficients obtained. For example, the author states (para. 3.6.2): "The variable technical assistance of vulgarization (assv) influences negatively and significantly the agricultural activities. This result shows that producers whatever are their selections and adoptions do not benefit from elementary advice concerning the conduct of the various cultures and few agricultural investments are granted for selected and adopted agricultural activities. The result invalidate the works of Ouédraogo (2004); Jensen P. et al. (2008); Jensen (2007) whose results show that the investments which are granted for creation of the varieties and for their vulgarization give a profitability rate of 81, 28 % . " This paragraph is exemplary of the three main problems with the manuscript. The first is the confusion between causal relation and correlation, especially important for a logit model, which is spelled out without any reference to its probabilistic nature, the endogeneity and the sample selection problems. The second is the propensity of the author to accept the verdict of a regression without prior economic theory, or, rather, with the assumption that economic theory would follow from the regression results, whatever they happen to be. The third is the claim that an unqualified and theoretically unsupported results from a logit estimate without a prior theoretical base can "invalidate" the results obtained by somebody else.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pasquale Lucio Scandizzo</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Center for International Economic Studies (CEIS) and Economics Foundation, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy</i>